

Fam
329.971
M158f
1932

FROM THE Farmer's Standpoint

by I. V. MACKLIN

BEING a discussion of some of the subjects dealt with by 1932 U. F. A. convention and also of other matters that may be of interest to U. F. A. members.

To the U. F. A. Members in the
Directorate of Peace River North

Greeting

One of the duties and privileges of a U. F. A. director is to visit in person the locals in his territory, but owing to lack of paid up membership, very few visits will be possible this year.

TARIFF, BONUS, INTEREST, SALARIES MORATORIUM and General Observations

Locals do wish to know, however, just exactly what their movement is working for and how the work is progressing.

Pressure of the same circumstances which press other farmers make it difficult for your director to spend much of his time on the road this year especially, gratis. So maybe a letter would take the place of a personal visit.

What could I say in a special visit to your local?

TARIFF AND BONUS

One of the farmers burdens is tariff. If he cannot get it removed, should he demand a bonus on his products to compensate him for the extra costs borne by him because of the tariff?

The consumers of wheat in Germany France and Italy are paying well on to two dollars per bushel. You are getting less than fifty cents. Why? The chief reason is a tariff in those countries against our wheat of around one dollar per bushel. In my local store I pay around two dollars for a pocket knife or a stable lantern, for which a producer in Europe would receive, no doubt, less than fifty cents. Why do we pay so much and he receive so little? The answer again is tariff.

It was not so bad for wheat growers in Western Canada when a Canadian tariff raised the price of what we buy, but now that European tariffs have lowered the price of the wheat we sell, the financial position of many farmers in western Canada is desperate, even though a good crop has been secured.

What is the U.F.A. doing about it?

The U.F.A. has in the main demanded free trade, but under the Bennett government, we have seen the tariffs go higher than ever. So that now, while not giving up the fight for free trade, as our ultimate objective, a determined body of opinion in the 1932 convention carried on a fight for a change of U.F.A. policy in this matter.

A resolution asking for a bonus on agricultural production which would offset the benefits gained by the manufacturer through the tariff, was vigorously debated, passed and then reconsidered. The convention agreed with the wheat bonus of five cents and asked that where a man's crop was lost through hail or drouth, he should be given \$1.00 per acre by the government, but when it came to a bonus for other farm products, the convention balked and said we were going back on the "great principal of free trade." Your director fought for an adequate bonus for other farm products, on the following grounds.

If there was free trade between

Europe and Canada, we could get their fifty cent jack knife for our fifty cent wheat. If, however, the Canadian manufacturer can raise the price of his product above the world price by the means of a tariff, and the price of the farmers product can be raised just as much above world prices by means of a bonus, then the purchasing power of the farmer would be restored. There would then be a "right relationship of prices" within Canada.

Western farmers cannot pay war-time prices for machinery and get one-fifth of war-time prices for wheat. Farm products have struck a new level and other industries may seek to stay above that level, but time will tend to flatten the manufacturer down, unless he helps to raise the farmer up.

It would not be so bad for the farmer if all Canadians went down to lower levels together. When the price of farm products went to half, if manufactured products went to half, if all the debts and interest went to half, if rents and salaries went to half, then we would all be in the same relative position as before and business in Canada would be as flourishing as ever. The manufacturers are organized and so are the financiers and others to take the depressions out of their business. Subject the Canadian manufacturer, however, to world conditions and we would see many of them on a level with the farmer very suddenly.

Is it best for Canada as a whole, that others within Canada should be brought to the farmers low level, or that the farmer should be brought to the others high level? This is a question for locals to discuss and decide before next convention.

If other classes within Canada who get rich through special privilege, had those excess profits drained away by heavier income tax in order to bonus agricultural production, then they would be more apt to say, what is the use of a tariff if its benefits to us are to be taken away to pay a bonus?

If a thief be allowed to retain the goods, stealing is liable to continue, but if they were always taken away from him, he is liable to favor honesty as the best policy. In other words the quickest way for us to get free trade or freer trade in Canada is to tax those who benefit by the tariff, in order to bonus the farmers. Give the farmer a big enough bonus and he can pay any price for his manufactured goods.

England may hasten the movement toward world free trade by adopting a tariff policy and showing other na-

tions how it feels to have their goods shut out.

HOW THEY WORK IT

For over sixty years the Canadian farmer has voted against his own interest. How could he do otherwise? If he voted at all he had to vote for one of the old political parties. Both stood for tariff. One said they were high tariff, and one said they were low tariff, but in reality, on a twenty year average, the difference between liberal and conservative tariff has been less than one per cent.

But how could the old political parties do otherwise? They had to have money to run an election and if big business put up the money, then naturally after the election, the government had to grant to big business the special privileges desired by them. The farmer didn't count. Labor didn't count. Even today the farmers only have a handful of men, and labor a thimbleful, directly representing them at Ottawa. But the rest of the West is awakening and things may be different after another election.

EMPTY EGG SHELLS

The Home Market was one bait used to catch the farmer voters of Canada in the tariff trap. It is a slight benefit. But in the main this is how it works.

Let us say cattle are worth 8 cents per pound in London. If the shipping cost is 2 cents from Montreal, they will be 6 cents in Montreal. If the shipping charges are 2 cents from Edmonton to Montreal, they will be 4 cents in Edmonton. If the shipping charges are 1 cent from the Peace River country to Edmonton, they will be 3 cents per pound here. In other words if there is one steer too many in Canada, the price of the hundreds of thousands of cattle consumed in Canada drops, alas! not to the price on a world market. The Canadian farmer would be overjoyed if the Canadian consumer paid the price paid on a world market of 8 cents per pound. But our home market gives us the world price less the total cost of transportation.

If the Canadian manufacturers lived in London, our cattle prices would be little effected, neither would the price of our grain. If they were in London, they would have no incentive to pervert Canadian political policy and bamboozle the farmers into electoral support of a tariff policy which tends to increase the price of what they buy and does little to raise the price of what they sell.

A NEW POLICY REQUIRED

Take a village or town. Eggs may be a fair price as long as there is a scarcity of eggs. But let the hens lay one egg too many and the whole price fabric goes tumbling to the ground. It is so with butter and hogs. We read that we have one hog out of ten too many for home consumption. Prices of manufactured goods in Canada warrant a price of 8 cents for hogs, but we get less than three cents here. The weight of that five cent loss all falls on that tenth hog. Poor cuss, it is too bad somebody didn't shoot him, together with the extra hen.

Magazine writers and the Dominion government tell us, that we must lower production costs by getting hens that will lay more eggs per hen, cows that will give more butter per cow, sows that will raise more and better pigs per sow, wheat that will yield more per acre. In this way we will be able to accept the world price less the freight for what we sell and pay the world price, plus the freight, plus the tariff for what we buy. Such talk is what makes the wild west wild. The government will import better bulls and loan them to the farmers. But Argentine is importing better bulls also.

No final solution is found in making two kernels of wheat grow where one grew before when the world is glutted with wheat, or a two foot strip of bacon grow between the shoulders and hams of a hog where one grew before, if the world is glutted with bacon and Denmark ships bacon to Canada until stopped.

No! When every tenth sow in Canada needs annihilation. When it is openly advocated that every tenth cow in Wisconsin should be killed, every third row of cotton in the U. S. plowed down. When we are urged to limit production in grain and livestock and Brazil dumps millions of pounds of coffee into the ocean, and oil wells are shut down in Oklahoma and kept shut by martial law, "something is rotten in the state of Denmark."

The old song of lowering production cost by higher yielding units becomes nauseating to the farmer, especially when the yield along all lines is too high already.

As farmers, we appreciate the assistance given by the government, through scientific agriculturists, to help us to lower production costs so we can meet foreign competition on world markets. But why doesn't the government help the manufacturers to meet foreign competition by showing them how to lower production costs. Instead of giving them tariff protection. The government in one breath tells the farmer to lower production costs and in the next breath raises the tariff which raises his production costs.

If tariffs must be, then let a bonus to agricultural production offset the burden imposed on farmers by the tariff. When the farmer goes down, Canada goes down.

A great portion of Canada's debt abroad is paid in wheat. Those products which Canada needs from other countries are largely paid for by wheat. Other people in Canada may think they will let the farming industry bite the dust in death while they ride on to victory. When farming falls, they will have nothing to ride, and the poor boobs are helpless on foot, as they will soon find out.

Tariffs shelter inefficiency and corruption.

A manufacturer puts a dollar into a concern which would be profitable without a tariff, but because of the tariff, he is able to charge so much for his goods that he can declare a 40 per cent. dividend. That doesn't look good, so he gives every shareholder three extra shares gratis for every one paid for, or sells the three shares and pockets the money and thus reduces the dividend to 10 per cent.

The farmer buys land in order to have a place to live. He pays out his dollar and is lucky if he can draw dividends on 25 cents of it. Nature demands balance.

If the manufacturer can multiply his dividend producing capitalization by four, somebody else must divide theirs by four, and the victim is the farmer.

If one class of society gets something for nothing, some other class must get nothing for something.

For every dollar of watered stock in business, there is likely to be a dollar of actual investment in a farm that receives no return whatever.

STARVE FOR PRINCIPLE

One fine old debater at the U. F. A. convention urged the delegates to draw up their belts another notch and stand by the old principle of free trade. Are those who ask for a bonus on farm production wicked and untrue to the highest ideals of life? Is tariff a principle or simply an economic policy?

Italy normally importing 40 million bushels of wheat, figures that in case of war, when a hostile navy might control the ocean, she might go very hungry for bread. So Mussolini ordered the vineyards torn up for wheat production and in order to stimulate wheat production and make Italy more capable of existence during war time, she puts on nearly a dollar of tariff on a bushel of wheat. Is that action wickedness or is it simply economic folly? Or is it folly during peace and wisdom in case of war?

Can we place the champion of the principle of free trade beside Socrates and Galileo?

CONFLICTING PRINCIPLES

The principle of self preservation is the one on which the Canadian farmer is acting now and it is more funda-

mental than the principle of free trade. Self preservation demands a bonus, since we have not got free trade.

If a madman enters a home and kills one child, will the father fold his arms and say, I stand by the principle of peace and allow the killing to continue?

Idealists, to be practical, must maintain their existence by adjusting their activity to the world as it is, while they continue to labor for a world as they would like it to be.

Is it good principle to starve, or to let a family starve or suffer, just because we as a western people have thought so long about free trade that we are too lazy to pursue another line of thinking? If we cannot put ourselves on a level of equality of opportunity with other industries by the free trade route, then does it prove wickedness on our part if we try the bonus route. It is equality of opportunity with other classes that the farmers want and we must try every means available.

If we could wipe out special privilege, that would be best. But if unobtainable, then special privilege all round is more fair than special privilege to the few. If we tax every occupation ten cents in order to give every occupancy ten cents, then those who are now alone favored by tariff will see the folly of protection.

As long as the farmer of the dark ages allowed the robber barons to live by robbery, they continued to rob. When the farmers were able to recover the stolen goods, then robbery ceased to be of any value and the barons ceased to rob and the dark ages ceased to be so dark. The barons were then fed by the farmer for military service rendered.

WHERE WILL THE MONEY COME FROM TO PAY THE BONUS?

The statement that seemed to do more than anything else to defeat the bonus idea, both in 1931 and in 1932 conventions, was that ultimately the farmer himself will have to pay the bonus to himself. The thought behind the statement being that the farmer being the source of all wealth, must pay ultimately, and that every tax levied on the rich will be passed on to the poor. Both of these ideas are false.

FARMER THE SOURCE OF ALL WEALTH

In the days of the feudal system in England the statement was less false than now. In addition to the wealth coming from the seas, forests and mines, we now have our gigantic factories and water powers expending their energy in the production of light and heat and to supply the innumerable needs of man. Someone has said that the other sources of power supply two hundred times as much power as is supplied by the arms of the citizens themselves. Light, when it was a tal-

low candle, used to come from the farm, but neither coal oil, gasoline or electricity come from that source now. So we cannot say that all wealth comes from the farm. Indeed, as civilization reaches a higher standard of living, the proportion of the income of the average citizen used to purchase farm products becomes smaller and smaller. What the farmer receives of the amount spent for farm products is very small too. A householder whose pantry is rich in bran flakes at 15 cents per 4 oz. package, that is 60 cents per pound or \$36.00 per bushel. Over \$35.00 of that wealth was not created on the farm because the farmer gets less than one dollar per bushel for his wheat. Surely if it is desirable to rebuild the purchasing power of the farmer by a bonus, it cannot be successfully argued that he with his 40 cent wheat will have to bear all of the expense involved in doing so out of his 40 cents, and those who get \$35.60 pay nothing.

PASSING TAXES ON

A pernicious idea is held by many that if we succeeded in taxing the rich they will just pass the tax on to the poor in increased prices. But that process is not always possible. If the prices of many things were raised further, the people would do without them, or make them by hand. Taxes on goods, however, can sometimes be passed on.

Income tax cannot be passed on or successfully shelved. To make it simple, suppose we say that \$4,000.00 is enough for any family in Canada to live on and the income tax on income beyond that, is not 10 per cent, but 100 per cent. One man in Canada will pay one million dollars income tax. Suppose he says I will pass this tax on by doubling the sale price of my light, heat or power. I will then have two million income. That will be fine, because the income tax would just take two million away from him, and give it to those who had to pay for the light, heat and power, and to the farmer as a bonus, to help buy the goods which he needs, which goods may have been made in a factory run by that power. The income tax will not be passed on because it is futile to do so.

The Russian system is not necessary in Canada. But some system is necessary to save the farmer from ruin as a result of such low prices. It is national wisdom to help the farmer and a bonus on his products seems to be the only available way. Let the farmer quit producing as a result of low prices and what will Canadian exports amount to? How will Canada's debts abroad or interest thereon be paid?

Manufacturers say they cannot compete with world prices at home let alone abroad. So their products will not pay Canada's foreign debts.

A SELF CONTAINED NATION

The above idea of the present dominion government is certainly a ter-

rible catastrophe to western Canada.

If we produce just enough wheat for Canada, then three acres out of every four must be abandoned. A continuation of such low prices will enforce that desertion of the land. The only way the majority of the farmers in western Canada are holding on right now is by virtue of a delay in bankruptcy proceedings. Canadian statesmanship seems to be woefully uncertain. At one period they flood the wheat lands with settlers to grow wheat. The next move is to ruin their export markets by shutting out imports.

"Trade or Die" is the heading of an article in McLean's Magazine. It seems to be unavoidable.

"Specialization of labor" is the basis on which civilization has advanced from tribal days when the tribe was self contained.

As a nation we cannot export the product of our labor unless we will import the product of the labor of other nations. In endeavoring to shut out imports from Canada, our premier has hit the West such a blow that we are hardly recovered sufficiently to realize where the blows, which have stunned us, have come from.

A self contained man would be a "Robinson Crusoe" possible in a warm climate, impossible as close as we are to the North Pole.

We must specialize and arrange exchange of goods to attain any average standard of living. Trade restrictions check human progress and are a step backward. But as long as only one-fourth of Canada's population lives on the western prairies our need of free trade can continue to be ignored by the other three-fourths who can vote us down.

It would seem to some of us that the quickest way to kill the protection idea is to work it to death. Let us "make the tariff fight" for us as was promised before last election.

Now since it is difficult for farmers to organize themselves 100 per cent, in order to take advantage of a tariff, the only thing for them is to demand a bonus on farm products.

If manufacturers get two prices for their stuff, farmers need two prices for theirs, in order to buy it. A bonus to the farmer would restore his buying power and start factories running and relieve unemployment.

OPINION

The foregoing is only the opinion of your director. The resolution based thereon may be wrong. It received almost no support in 1931 convention, it carried in 1932, but was reconsidered and voted down afterwards.

Contrary to newspaper reports, the convention voted for the 5 cent bonus on wheat and asked also that where a farmer lost his crop through hail or drought, one dollar per acre be paid by the government. The resolution which was finally voted down asked that the bonus be not 5 cents, but one equivalent to the benefits received by the

manufacturer through the tariff. It asked also that it be paid not on wheat alone, but also on other farm products.

Surely the producer of cream at 10 cents per pound butter fat, needs a bonus and so does the producer of 3 cent hogs and 3 cent cattle. Moreover some of the congested money needs to be put into circulation to start things moving again. A higher income tax would tap and relieve the congestion. An adequate bonus on farm products would make it possible for farmers to pay off their indebtedness and restore their buying power, which as long as it remains so low will continue to keep factories shut down and traffic more or less at a stand still.

The Bonus resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas we appreciate the bonus on wheat by the Dominion Government and

"Whereas there is no bonus for other agricultural products.

"Therefore be it resolved that we demand that the Dominion Government bonus agricultural production, and that the amount of bonus be in proportion to the benefits enjoyed by the manufacturers through the tariff."

Does your local want this resolution passed or defeated again at next convention? Does it want to amend it? The constituency convention is the place to thresh it out.

INTEREST AND SALARIES

Another great problem facing the farmer today is, that while his income has shrunk to half or one-third; his outlay in interest and salaries is the same or nearly so. A case from last depression to illustrate the problem.

In the year 1918, Mr. X bought a big team of young horses for \$625.00, paying \$125.00 cash and giving a note for \$500.00 at 10 per cent. interest. The interest therefore was \$50.00 per year on the team. Before the \$500.00 was paid, the price level of farm products dropped. Feed wheat \$1.81 in 1919, to 11 cents in 1920; oats from \$1.10 for seed in the spring of 1920 to practically nothing in the fall of 1920; cattle from ridiculously high prices to almost no price at all.

The \$625.00 team would bring in 1920 around \$100.00. But the interest on indebtedness with respect to the horses was still \$50.00 per year or 50 per cent. of the value of the horses, not 10 per cent.

Those who control credit control also the prices. If the amount of credit or medium of exchange in circulation is half, then the general price level will be half. And the creditor who gets half of his interest in a depression will receive as much buying power, or as much of the debtor's labor as he received in good times, getting the whole of his interest.

The resolution dealing with this matter and coming from the North was as follows:

"Whereas the low price of farm products is making it extremely difficult for farmers to carry on, and

"Whereas the burden of interest payments has not been reduced to conform with the reduction in the ability of the farmers to pay them;

"Therefore, be it resolved, that the rate of interest should vary in harmony with general price levels, and

"Be it further resolved, that salaries should vary with the purchasing power thereof."

The U.F.A. is fighting for a stabilized currency or "measure of value" through national control of credit. We do not want a yard stick which shall measure off so much labor as payment of a debt in one year, and two or three times as much in some other year.

National control can assist greatly to our end, but international action is also necessary.

In the meantime, however, as long as the "measure of value" is going to vary, is it not well, is it not just, that payments of interest, or principal or salaries, in terms of that "measure of value" or money should vary in proportion?

In France, Germany and Russia, after the war, injustice was done to the creditor class because of inflation. The man who lived on interest or on a salary, could not buy very much when the value of the franc went from twenty cents to less than four cents. It would have been a great boon to the salaried man or drawer of interest in France if, when the price of commodities went up five times as high in terms of French money (franc), the interest and salaries had gone up five times as high also. It is only possible in Canada to continue to pay interest and salaries, if since the price of commodities by which we pay are lowered the amount we pay is similarly lowered.

But, says the housekeeper in a city home, "It is only when I buy a whole pig or some cracked wheat for porridge, or some butter or eggs direct from the farmer, that I get any great reduction in price. Everything else is much the same price as ever. The average price of all that I buy is still 80 per cent. of what it used to be."

Very good, then \$80.00 will buy as much as a \$100.00 did formerly and a twenty per cent. reduction in interest or salaries would be no reduction at all in real purchasing power. Once start the ball rolling and a cut in interest would cut rent and taxes, and this in turn would relieve the city lady of some more costs so that probably 70 cents would buy as much as a dollar used to. In order for Canada to carry on satisfactorily, we must by some means establish and maintain in periods of world depression and in periods of boom, "A right relationship of prices" within our borders.

Jack Canuck can make little progress if his financial leg is as long as ever, and his agricultural leg is cut off at the knee. Progress involves either shortening the other leg to suit, (by cutting down interest) or of put-

ting on a wooden leg, (an adequate bonus). We must advocate both and let the government either do a little of both or else do either one it chooses.

Depressions a harvest of securities for the financiers.

The farmers alone cannot alter the national financial policy. As long as depressions and low prices increase, the real purchasing power of the salaried man's salary or the capitalist's interest, these citizens will give us little help in our programme of stabilization. But if depressions ceased to benefit other classes, those classes might be willing to help in eliminating the depressions.

INCOME DOWN, OUTLAY MUST GO DOWN

Interest is a dominion matter. Salaries are both dominion and provincial. The income of the province in 1930 was probably less than half of what it was in 1928. Yet salaries were the same and interest was the same. It is fair that each citizen of Alberta should have a fair standard of living if he is performing necessary service to society.

The producers reward is prices.

The capitalists reward is interest.

The professionals or officials reward is salary.

Let us suppose that the income of the province in 1928 was 200 million. This all goes to the producer who has to pay half of it or 100 million in 1928 for interest and salaries. Let us suppose that the income of the whole province in 1930 is 100 million. Then if the interest and salaries are the same in 1930 as they were in 1928, there will be nothing left for the producer. Suppose then the producer quits producing where will the interest and salaries come from then? The only way that many farmers are carrying on today is by not paying the interest or taxes (which go to pay salaries, etc).

Would it not be better for all classes in our dominion or province if we went up and down together and each class take their share of the bitter and the sweet. All classes are irrevocably joined together for richer and for poorer, for better and for worse. One class may shove the extra burden on to another for a time. But "its a long lane that has no ending."

In the aggregate, the difficulties are minimized by sharing them among the various branches of society.

THE CAPITALIST THE MODERN PRIEST

So far the only class whose income (interest) is sacred, is the capitalist.

Human life is not sacred, because the hospital must be closed if it cannot pay the interest.

The income of the preacher can be reduced, but not that of the man who loaned money.

The reward of the producer can be reduced to less than the cost of production, the salaried man can be tossed to the bread line, but the income of

those who draw interest must be maintained. Though the "pound of flesh" means the death of business, though the death of the business Sampson means the fall of the pillars of civilization as we know it, yet fair or unfair New York says, "I must have my bond." The same is said by both great and small.

The modern term is the "Right of Contract".

Everybody agrees that if a man contracts to pay so many dollars of principal or interest, he must do so or give up his security and go bankrupt. That would be fair if the levels on which we operate remained fairly constant, and if the labor content of the dollar remained the same.

But economic science says, "If you double the money or credit in circulation, you double the prices." "If you halve the circulating medium, you halve the prices." In other words, those who control credit also control price levels.

Mr. X then borrows a dollars worth of wheat when wheat is a dollar per bushel. Finance then by restriction halves the prices. The debtor must then pay back twice as much wheat as he borrowed. In reality, men or nations borrow only goods and pay back only goods. The deal, however, is reckoned in terms of money. The repayment in terms of goods may be fair, but in terms of a varying "measure of value" may be half fair and half robbery. But that is the "right of contract" which as it works out in actual practice in booms and depressions is the right to trap the unwary, to take his fur and turn him loose till during another depression he is ready to be skinned again.

The European nations are about ready to say to the United States, just let things rest. The U. S. A. loaned wheat to Europe at \$2.50 per bushel. She has lowered the values of goods, which could be given to her in payment, by restriction of credit and by tariffs. She demands gold in payment, and the world only holds half enough to pay her. Here then is the question.

If a contract is made on a certain basis or level of prices, is it fair to give the creditor nation or class, the right to enforce that contract, if that creditor nation or class has in the meantime altered the very basis on which the contract was made?

Germany for one has said, no!

Whether it is fair or not, she has declared that it is impossible, to enforce "the right of contract" when the basis is changed. She also says in effect, if you think you can enforce it, hop to it. Other European nations, including honorable England, are also thinking very seriously about the right of international contracts.

What then about the public and private contracts of Western Canada, where the chief means of fulfillment of those contracts is by farm products of which the more you grow, the further you go behind? We might as

well face the issue as to drift along.

Either a good big bonus or a reduction of the interest burden or a little of both would help at the present time.

A MORATORIUM

Until something is done, either to lighten the burden or to give the farmer greater strength to bear it, the farmer demands a cessation of forcible evictions because of debt.

Resolutions in favor of a moratorium until prices returned to normal were sent in from three different constituency associations in the province.

One argument against the moratorium was that it would ruin the farmers' credit and the credit of the province.

One answer to that objection is that the farmers' credit is already ruined and neither can the province borrow in the U.S.A.

Then again a moratorium has been described as a cessation of legal proceedings against all debts. It was not so in Germany. It was simply against a particular debt. It is debts contracted during the high levels obtaining prior to 1930 which are so difficult to pay on the low levels of today. A moratorium declared with respect to debts contracted prior to 1930, would make it easier for business to carry on at present and make credit more possible for current requirements than when returns are subject to the impossible burdens of the past.

The resolutions asked that the moratorium remain until price levels return to what they were when the dollars were loaned.

The moratorium resolutions were defeated by a small majority. But the convention did ask that no foreclosure proceedings be proceeded with until the case had been first brought before the "Debt Adjustment Bureau." The board of directors also asked that no farmer be evicted from his home at present. The ground for such request being that if times were normal, the evicted man could get a job some where else, but under present conditions, he would be liable to require public relief.

COMPETITION VERSUS CO-OPERATION

The United Farmers of Alberta have become convinced and are practically of one mind, as to the ultimate goal of their movement. But they are not at all settled as to the best method of reaching that objective. The delegates expressed almost unanimously their approval of "A Co-operative Commonwealth" as their goal. We have yet to agree on the road to be travelled to reach it.

It is the responsibility and opportunity of the U.F.A. members, the locals and the constituency associations to survey out a road through the surrounding economic chaos during the year 1932, and to bring a blue print of such survey to the convention of 1933 for its approval.

The United Farmers are keenly conscious of the many human problems left unsolved under the free play of economic competition. Yet our co-operative efforts so far have not fully solved those problems either.

"Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles."

We have been trying to graft fruit bearing branches on to non-fruit bearing trees of the primitive forest. It can't be done. If we lop off the branches of the competitive tree and plant fruit trees along side, then the sap and strength of the old root system will send up new shoots and soon strangle any new growth which must establish itself both root and branch. After ten years of cutting off branches of the competitive system, the United Farmers have concluded that the top root of the whole system is finance. What are we going to do about it? It is hitting the western farmer hard. He must solve the problem.

At the 1932 convention there were resolutions dealing with debt, interest and taxes; resolutions dealing with prices and salaries. All these are questions of finance.

The 1932 convention made some progress. It rests with the U. F. A. membership as to what 1933 convention will do. Maybe you don't intend to pay your U.F.A. dues in 1932 and be a member. Maybe you think the organized farmers can do nothing.

Benjamin Franklin said regarding the polar discoveries, "It must be done and England ought to do it."

Almost everybody, both in city and country, now says, "something must be done" and let us add the United Farmers of Alberta ought to do it. They have been the pioneers on many another frontier of intellectual activity. They have surveyed out, completed and travelled a practical highway to effective action at Ottawa and Edmonton.

The financial problem is an international one. But the world is made up of nations. If each nation says we are in the grip of international finance. We can do nothing; nothing will be accomplished. Each nation can and must do something. But Canada is made up of provinces and each province can and must do something. What is it that it can and must do?

Individuals have also their duty and opportunity. The present economic system was made by man and can be changed by him. The economic chaos we are in was made by man, and can be cleared up by him.

DIVINE RIGHTS

Many men, not many centuries ago, believed in the "Divine Right of Kings," especially the kings.

Many men today believe in the Divine Right of the "Money Kings," especially the money kings.

A king, whose position was won by actual superior ability for leadership, administration or conquest, often left his position to a son who had no such ability. It has now come to pass in

most countries, that there is no crown to inherit and where there is, the position involves little or no real power.

Political leadership is now won by men called Premiers, and not inherited by those who happen to be king's sons.

In the economic realm the time is approaching when economic leadership will be won by the sheer capacity of the individual for service to the public. In the immediate past, men of outstanding economic or financial ability have captured trade and become money kings in the same manner as old fighters used to capture territory and become kings.

A BIBLICAL PARALLEL

King David, of Hebrew history, unified, consolidated and strengthened the people whose leadership he gained by his ability. His son Solomon inherited the position, won by his father and through increasing taxation, in order to surround himself and his court with grandeur, the lot of the common people began to get harder. Under the next generation of kings, the kingdom went to pieces. All the people had under the third generation of kings was the burdens of keeping up the king in style, without any administrative ability. We are in a similar position today with our money kings.

The tribute paid yearly in Canada averages over \$525.00 per year per family. What do the money kings do for the public by way of capable economic administration? It looks as though that about the only thing they do is to try to draw their tribute. If the public is to get out of the tangle, they are in, it looks as though they will have to get out themselves, not with the assistance of financial Jereboams and Reaboams, but in spite of them.

TRIBUTE PAID TO MONEY KINGS

The U.F.A. stands for public ownership, not private ownership, of all indestructible wealth, placed here by the Creator, also of those things created by man which tend to become monopolies. The U.F.A. stands for private ownership of those personal assets which are created by the particular individual for his legitimate use and enjoyment.

COST OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

Recorded on Hansard, page 2335, of June 1st, 1931, are the words of R. B. Bennett, Premier of Canada, as follows: "It is necessary to compare the figures with those of the geographical distribution of all capital employed in Canada. It is estimated that the amount is \$17,500,000,000.00. This sum . . . excludes private capital in domestic enterprises such as farms and homes. Our national wealth is probably in the neighborhood of \$30,000,000,000.00." Seventeen and a half billion dollars is the capital employed in Canada, because Premier Bennett said

so, in his budget speech of 1931. But Canadians are trying to pay interest on that capital which at 6 per cent., amounts to \$525.00 per year per family. Now try and get that out of 40 cent wheat, 3 cent hogs and cattle, 10 cents for butter fat, and see if you can pay it and live.

Private ownership of water powers, oil wells, financial institutions and everything else demands that interest be paid on this 17½ billion dollars of "capital employed in Canada", before schools, hospitals or factories can open their doors. The sick may die, intelligence may die, business may die, but the one billion and fifty million dollars yearly of interest must be paid. The U.F.A. says it cannot be paid. It is impossible for a ten hundred pound pack horse to carry a twelve hundred pound load.

THE FINANCIAL COLLAPSE

Some great economists prophecy a collapse of the present economic system. That breakdown is not coming. It is here. How much greater breakdown does anybody want than that our goods bring less than the cost of production.

Germany has declared that the international financial structure has already collapsed as far as she is concerned. And whether we say it or not, the financial structure has collapsed as far as the farmers of western Canada are concerned. It might be a more accurate picture of facts to say that though the structure still stands, it is dead, and will stay dead until something very fundamental is done.

The heavy machinery of the great financial factory requires 100 horse power to make it run.

The farmers can generate about 40 horse power. So the solution must be to lighten the load or increase the power.

Who will do that? Will the senate of Canada reform itself? Will the financiers of Canada reform themselves and loosen the hold they have upon the people?

The answer is: "There is no one to save the farmers but themselves." Will they face the task? Or in times of difficulty, will they weakly disband like a herd of buffalo which formed a circle and protected themselves from devouring wolves, but later on, decided to separate, and become a prey to the carnivorous creatures, awaiting their lack of unity.

The farmer is like the plant eating animals:

"United we stand,
Divided we fall."

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

We have probably given space to the bonus resolution and its relation to tariff out of proportion to its importance relative to such matters as finance.

If the U. F. A. convention adopted the idea of a bonus for agriculture, as an offset to the tariff for the manufacturer, it would be a radical change

in tactical procedure. The proposed change merits thorough discussion in locals and constituency associations, because the same idea is liable to come up again in 1933 convention. We are not changing our ultimate goal of free trade, but if we ask for a bonus, we are changing our method of reaching that goal. A homesteader might not believe in the principle of lighting prairie fires, but if such a fire happens to be raging toward him, he might light a backfire to save his home.

To save his home. That is the difficult task of so many western farmers today. That is therefore the chief immediate task of the U.F.A. movement. To that end we discuss:—"Bonus", "Moratorium", "Debt Adjustment Bureau", "Reduction of Interest and Salaries" and "Reduction of Principal."

WHAT'S THE USE

Many farmers lack faith in themselves or their class to do anything for themselves. But listen, you have all seen pictures of the lady "Justice" holding a balance in her hand.

Now we believe through the educational efforts of such movements as the U.F.A., men and women are shifting their position from one side of that scale to the other. We believe that they are moving from the side of "special privilege" and "exploitation" to the side of "equal rights" and "co-operation." The "special privilege" side is heaviest now; but some day the "equal rights" side will tip the balance in the public favor and the superficial observer will say, "oh what a wonderful change, and it came so suddenly." They will not have noticed that while they and "their companions slept" there were others who were "tolling upward through the night."

Fellow farmers, "keep right on to the end of the road."

THE CREATOR IS GOOD

Nature has been kind to man and the earth is full of the things needed to supply our bodily requirements. The financiers however call it "overproduction" and regard it as an evil. It is our financial system which turns the blessing of God into the curse of man. Finance demands a condition of "scarcity" and will create it in order to function. We had better introduce a system which will operate in a condition of "plenty", because with the aid of invention, we are likely to have plenty from now on. If the air ceased to be under "government ownership" of a benevolent government. If it could be monopolized and some corporation given a charter to control the supply, then you would experience a scarcity of air. We would gasp for breath until we were willing to pay 8 per cent, at least for the use of it. Millions of people today stand thirsting beside wells that have an abundance of water. But somebody has run off with the bucket and rope. The

U.F.A. says that, that rope and bucket should be public property. As a member of that body do you agree?

Our financial system is the bucket by which we distribute or fail to distribute those things which humanity needs. If those things are plentiful and are not being distributed by the present system, then we had better devise a better system.

A CO-OPERATIVE SYSTEM

In this connection it is worth while to consider the programme of those who are working on the "Co-operative purchasing scheme." If money is going to be kept out of circulation by those who own it, and the government will not come the rescue, maybe by co-operation we could trade goods for goods. We might trade the goods of the co-operative agriculturist for the goods of the co-operative city man. We have the British Co-operative movement prepared to do this very thing.

CUT SALARIES TO PAY INTEREST

Direct pay for labor when it is low seems to be called wages when it is high, salaries. Labor unions fight decreases in wages. We are not talking about wages. The reason the resolution on interest and salaries is a double header dealing with two different subjects is this, that the usual way of doing is to reduce salaries so that interest can be paid in full. It would be more fair to reduce interest so that salaries could be paid in full than vice versa.

Money has been called stored up labor. It was probably stored up by someone who is now dead, and the reward of this stored up labor is now going to his heir or someone who is just as capable of earning a salary as the salaried man is. Probably the heir of this "stored up labor" is drawing a salary and could live on the reward for the labor he is doing in the present without any reward, for the labor which was done in the past (or interest on money). But we are not proposing to cut out interest, but only to reduce it in proportion to price levels, and the prices of commodities are the stuff by which it is paid. The proposition looks eminently fair. There were resolutions at the convention asking for a cancellation of interest, but they did not come from the north. An old man who stored up labor in the past might be still living. If prices are only half what they were when he loaned his money, then 4 per cent; interest would buy as much butter and eggs as 8 per cent. did three years ago.

UPSETTING THE SYSTEM

The U.F.A. people may be blamed for upsetting the present system. The system, however, has upset itself. It is out of order. It is a machine that will not run. It is like a car broke down a long way from home. The organized farmer is telling the other fellows in the car why it won't run, and trying to get them to help fix it. But finance and industry sit in the car and refuse to budge. If the farmer only had faith in himself, he would go

on without them. However, if the car sits there until Mr. bloated plutocrat begins to get hungry, he may help the organized farmer to patch up the old bus, so that it will move along again. There is little hope of finance ever doing much to correct depressions as long as everybody and especially governments agree that though the heavens fall, though starvation, despair and death stalk through this fertile land, yet interest must be paid and in full.

The farmer squeals, but why should the financial pig squeal during a depression, when for his 8 cents interest the farmer must bring nearly a pound of butter to his trough, and in normal times it was only one quarter of a pound.

Depressions have been in the past, a harvest for the financier. This one may not be. The financial monkey has put his hand into the picture and grabbed so many nuts this time that he will never be able to get his hand out until he lets loose of some of what he has within his grasp.

CONDEMN SYSTEM— NOT INDIVIDUALS

Let it be clearly understood that the organized farmer does not condemn the individuals who operate an oppressive financial system, or try to operate it when it won't work any more. They do condemn the system. We can hardly expect those who benefit by things as they are, to wish to change them to what they ought to be. In opposition to reform in ages past, those who made gain by manufacturing silver shrines for people to worship, stirred up the people to stone the bearer of truth. They shouted "Great is Diana Goddess of the Ephesians."

Those who fatten today on the difficulties of a distressed people, stir up the cry "Great is the dollar, God of the Canadians."

Suppose that Canadians just among themselves would, for one year, totally forget about gold and also about the paper dollar. Suppose they just traded goods or services for goods or services. Suppose the government would supply some book keepers to keep account of our transactions and if the individual gave to society more than he received, there would be a credit by his name. If he received more than he gave there would be a debit against his name.

If the measure of value be a penny for a day's work as in the year 1 A.D., there would not necessarily be any social difficulty, providing everything else was in proportion. The pay for the farmers labor has fallen very low, but that would not matter if everything else came down accordingly. What he buys in the future has got to come down or he can't buy it, what he bought or borrowed in the past has got to come down or he can't pay for it. But no! here is just the rub. The banker says you have got to cut wages and cut out buying new stuff, cut everything but I must have my in-

terest. Bow! Wow! We are supposed to wreck the present and ruin the whole future of society in order to be able to carry the dead weight of a load doubled or quadrupled by the deflation activities of those who laid on the burden in the first place.

The Hebrews used to have their "year of jubilee."

In that year those who were in debt went free.

Russia celebrated her year of jubilee by repudiation of debt. Germany practically repudiated her internal debt by inflation. France reduced her debts to about one fifth by inflation. Anglo Saxon countries alone have had their debts doubled by deflation.

What is the matter with Canada, Britain or Australia? In these countries almost every industry by which men live is like a camel, so loaded down, that it is scarcely able to raise and gather food for itself, let alone carry the load to any particular destination. So it is with debt in Anglo Saxon countries.

China is famed for ancestor worship. Anglo Saxon countries run a close second. An obligation of the past can be unfairly increased two or four times, it makes no difference, but it must be paid. The present and future don't count.

Now the U.F.A. movement has no thought of repudiation. They simply demand a fair and equitable adjustment. Such adjustment is inevitable. Why not make it before it comes to repudiation or to an orgy of inflation. Most of the farm debts today were created during the war, and \$2.50 wheat, or during 1928, when wheat was over \$1.00. It requires no prophet to predict that they will not be paid out of 40 cent wheat. Neither does the future look real bright for high priced wheat or other farm products.

If Russia can land gasoline in Uruguay, South America, at 5 cents per gallon, they can no doubt produce wheat cheaper than we can with 30 cent gasoline.

The U.F.A. movement is and has been fighting the battle for the farmer.

"Prosperity is just around the corner" sure enough, but there is a barricade of debt, which must be lowered sufficiently for the public to pass over it, before they can ever reach the corner.

Three ways lie open to the people to deal with the present debt situation. The first is to reduce the principal and interest to the same extent that the commodities are reduced by which they are paid. The second method is by financial inflation. If the financiers won't do it, then let the government do it. The third method as far as the farmer is concerned is to bonus his products to a price such as he received when the dollars were loaned.

THE COMING REVOLUTION

Some say that a revolution has got to come before things will get straight-

ened out. That is no dream, but it is here now. Everything the farmer has, has passed through the "economic revolution." The farmer can now watch the other fellows go through the machine, as go they must, and finance will be the last to go. The farmer may have his say as to whether finance goes or not.

The Russian revolution simply took the possessions of the rich away from them and exiled the rich themselves. We in Canada have a far smoother method than that. We can by means of the "Income Tax", take all or any part of the income of any rich man away from him. We can leave him to operate his industry which is far better than exiling him and getting an inexperienced manager. As to his possessions. It is just as well that the capitalist own his possessions as long as the public gets the revenue. On the death of the capitalist there is no need to mention such ugly words as "confiscation by the state." We already have the "Inheritance Tax."

If the majority of the voters wished it to be 100 per cent. instead of 10 per cent., they could have it so if they wished to vote that way.

We are to blame, if we let others run the country for us and they don't run it to suit us. Victories used to be won by strength of arm. Now they are won through strength of mind. We have got to think our way out of our difficulties. If we let others do all of the thinking, they will think their way out and leave the farmer in.

Your U.F.A. director is not giving you an official pronouncement, but simply discussing various topics with you. If such discussion tends to stimulate your interest in the fight for "economic liberty," he will have gained his objective. The common people have gained "religious liberty," "civil liberty" and "political liberty." The fight is now on, for "economic liberty".

Our U.F.A. members at Ottawa are carrying the struggle to the heart of our broad dominion. Our men at Edmonton are also on the job. They are prepared to move when and where the voters of this province say. Our honored provincial Premier has said something like this, that anything they have in Russia, you can also obtain by your vote. Do you as a farmer know what you want? If you do, do you know how to get it? If you do, can you get a majority of voters in this province or dominion to believe that you have a solution for the problems of today? Do not hesitate, and say what can I do? You may be able to do little but your idea, if good can do much, because, "ideas rule the world." The world is not governed by fact but by opinion, and is needing some new opinions right now. The U.F.A. local and constituency associations, and the annual conventions are the place to pool your opinions and have them rejected, amended or passed.

Your director would be pleased and profited by having his errors in econo-

mic philosophy noted and corrected by U.F.A. members in the north. Any information desired by members regarding U.F.A. matters could be indicated to your director and answered if possible in another letter at some future date.

We have attempted to indicate something of what is in the minds of U.F.A. members as to the aims and objects of the movement. How shall we reach those objectives? Here is where we need exhaustive discussion. We must fully survey every route over the "great divide," which separates the competitive world of today from the co-operative world of tomorrow. Every U.F.A. member must be acquainted with the details of each possible route, because any one can only be chosen by will of the majority of delegates from locals. If you as an individual do not approve of the aims of the U.F.A. movement, you will naturally oppose it. If you do approve, you may assist.

In the north are many new settlements, wherein there may be individuals who have been U.F.A. members in the areas from which they came. If so, there is nothing more delightful to a U.F.A. director than to hear that a new local has organized itself and sent notices thereof to central.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

Regarding world conditions, it would appear that when money is borrowed for war, there is no asset created, out of which to pay back the loan. War destroys life and property. It would have been as sane, to borrow life as to borrow property. When destroyed neither can be returned. Since wealth was neither volunteered nor conscripted during war, it must be volunteered or conscripted now to pay for the war or else the war debts cancelled. Until this is done, world business is likely to be in a condition of suspense, uncertainty and partial paralyses.

In Canada the various occupations are like dominoes stood on end. The fall of the wheat farmer knocks down the one next to him and so on down the line. Given an equal chance with world competitions the western Canadian farmer can stand against all comers. Compare his cost of production with that of the Russian wheat grower. Under the Russian system, the land is free. In Canada one quarter or one third of the crop goes for rent, first shot. If the farmer has bought the land an amount similar to the rent goes for interest. Next, in Russia the machinery will be probably less than half the cost of similar machinery in Canada. Then, Canadian railroads are supposed to meet some 150 million dollars of interest charges yearly out of the rates levied on the traffic. The Russian railroads have only the operating cost.

The Canadian farmer must carry these enormous packages on his back, from which his competitor in Russia

is practically free, and win the race to world markets, against that competitor. If he is unable to do this, the penalty is death to his business, and then what? The financiers will run the Canadian land the same as the Soviets run the land in Russia. Canadian finance has deflated the public out of its share of the ownership of Canadian industry and commerce. It will deflate the farmer out of his share of the ownership of Canadian agriculture. We will have a dictatorship of the financiers in Canada, to compare with the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia. In Canada we will have individuals drawing a million per year and masses on the bread line. In Russia, we have the leader of the proletariat drawing \$112.00 per month and the masses busy in industrial and agricultural production.

But no! We might have had a financial dictatorship in Canada, had it not been for the corruption of the financiers. The former government of Alberta set the forces of justice in motion against Solway-Mills, other provinces followed. The U.F.A. group in Ottawa laid the financial treachery in connection with Beauharnois bare. And now we hear of an effort to bring to the bar of justice, such men as Sir Herbert Holt, head of the Royal Bank and director of 135 other companies, for alleged swindling of the policy holders of the Sun Life Insurance Company. Surely it is time for a showdown between those who desire equal rights and those who desire special privilege. If the man who steals a loaf of bread must receive a jail sentence, surely the man who steals a hundred millions should not receive a knighthood.

The U.F.A. believes in state life insurance. The Dominion Government is liable to find itself in the life insurance business in the capacity of paying deficits created by the officials of the Sun Life.

The financiers believe in private ownership of railways, insurance, banks, etc., until they have exploited them to the fullest extent possible, then they don't care whether they go bust or whether the government takes them over.

The U.F.A. believes in the public ownership of profitable undertakings, not just those which have been ruined by private enterprise, like the C.N.R.

FEUDALISM VERSUS CAPITALISM

William the Conqueror subjugated the Anglo Saxon people and gave them a bare living under feudalism, while the rest of their earnings went to William and his friends. Our ancestors braved the terrors of the mighty deep to found on this continent a "land of the free." But behold! "William the Conqueror" has come hither also, and under capitalism has so manipulated our economic structure, that millions on this continent do not get the bare necessities of life. The surplus earnings under capitalism are enormous

as compared to what they were under Feudalism, but they all go to pay our "William the Conqueror" or "Bill" as we now say.

It is the interest "Bill" and the tax "Bill" that robs the modern labor of the fruits of toil today.

The tax "Bill" is to a great extent "interest." Of 16 million income of the province, we read that nearly 7 million is required to pay the provincial interest "Bill." With the Dominion Government it is much the same. With the railways we must pay a high freight rate in an impossible effort to make up the interest. On practically all of the book-keeping done between the individual and the rest of society in Canada, this great burden of interest must be borne by the business activities of the nation, and paid to the banks, because they have been given a monopoly of the business of supplying "the medium of exchange" for Canada.

The earldoms, the dukedoms and lordships conferred by William the Conqueror on his friends, were favors of little worth, as compared to the special privileges granted to the few by the Canadian Government who is supposed to represent the people.

The time is ripe, yes dead ripe for those, who earn their bread by service to society, to get together and establish this system of equal rights to all and special privilege to none. The service may be rendered in the country or the city. The service may be rendered by brawn or brain, but can you as a citizen any longer sit silent and watch the product of Canadian energy continue to be taken from those who produce it and need it, and given to those who "toil not neither do they spin." What matter if "Lord Plush-bottom" in England did duly inherit his feudalistic privileges? The British people have practically confiscated his favors and put him nearer a level with his fellow citizens. What matter also if "Bloated Plutocrat" in Canada has duly inherited his capitalistic privileges, a heavy "Income Tax" will cure bloat and an 100 per cent. "Inheritance Tax" would effectually prevent bloat in his offspring. If the offspring have the constructive enterprise of their ancestors, in their blood, they have an advantage over other children, even with an otherwise similar start. If they inherited millions, then their inherent constructive enterprise, is liable to be lost to their day and generation, in idleness and debauch.

"Not in vain the distance beckons.

Forward, forward let us range,

Let the old earth spin forever

Down the ringing grooves of change.

INACTION

Fellow farmer do not waste time in ineffectual grumbling. The voters of Canada have the power to change things by united action. Do not wait until the tax arrears or the arrears of interest crawl into your tent and you find yourself outside.

The United Farmers of Alberta in convention assembled in 1932 made few clear cut demands as to the course of action to be taken at Ottawa or Edmonton. If the voters don't know what they want, how can any government give it to them?

STUDY

We say again we cannot fight our way out of twentieth century difficulties. We must THINK our way out. Spend all your spare time on the daily newspaper or magazine story or at the show if you wish. But do not expect your collective difficulties to be overcome if you will not unite your mental energies to that end.

"Things will right themselves" is a falsehood believed only by the indolent. Things are dead. The fact is that if you do nothing, someone else may do something.

PHYSICAL REVOLUTION VERSUS MENTAL REVOLUTION

The only revolution needed in Canada is a mental one. Many ideas, supposedly sacred through age, but which will not work out in modern life, have got to be smashed and replaced by new ideas which will work. We need not look for change from those who profit by things as they are. A cow on a railroad track, often will not move in time, even though she can plainly see what is coming. Profiteers often will not move until the train of circumstances hits them.

One idea the public must discard is a sense of their futility or inability to better their own condition. A majority of the people, if they know what they want, and how to get it, is all powerful in Canada. Fighting solves no problems. The last great war made great shell holes which are mostly now filled up again. It destroyed many buildings which are now mostly built up again, but the problems of human life and happiness, remaining to be solved, have been increased rather than lessened by the great war. A mental revolution is what we need today. The guns of democracy must be pulled up the long grade of progress and turned on to the citadels of special privilege, graft and corruption. Before theft in high places can be carried out, it must be first conceived and carried out in the minds of the thieves. What a mental structure! Can we educate the coming generation to better thoughts than exist in the minds of those who now dominate the economic welfare of our dominion? Some of us think we can. We now educate for efficiency. That efficiency is often utilized to further evil designs. Our educational system is purely neutral as to how the education shall be used.

Physical power, used, to take from another what rightly belongs to him, will land the evil doer in jail. Mental power used, to do the same thing, may bring the evil doer a title. Physical power is a great asset. The development of great mental power is worthy of all of the expenditures made by our

educational institutions thereon. But until these educational institutions definitely undertake the development of moral power as well, the exploitation of the masses by men of high intellectual ability is liable to continue.

A democracy to be a success demands high moral calibre as well as high intellectual ability. A co-operative system (not compulsory as in Russia, but freely supported by free people as we hope for in Canada), will require a higher type of citizen than has manned the competitive system of the past. Are we as a state taking any steps to produce that higher type of citizen? This also is a question which U.F.A. people can think over.

At any rate do not cuss conditions, each of us must bear our share of blame, for we have our share of responsibility. Do not cuss, but rather (DISCUSS). An opinion arrived at by a majority of voters becomes speedily the law of the land.

We do not need to wait for election time to come round. Politicians have their ears to the ground.

The U.F.A. ideas do not and cannot please everybody. The radicals condemn us, as too conservative. The capitalists condemn us, as too radical. Changes are imminent in our social system. We have men both at Ottawa and Edmonton to look after the interests of the farmer. Will you support them by backing up the organization in 1932? The U. F. A. paper is endeavoring to consolidate U.F.A. opinion and keep us informed as to the facts. Does it merit your support? It has had to be cut from twice a month to once a month through lack of funds. An increase in membership would help the paper.

DEFENSE BY ATTACK

The British navy does not defend that island by hovering around her shores. In times of danger it moves to the scene of trouble on the coast of the enemy.

The U.F.A. organization is the farmers fighting force, in the economic battle. Our "men of war" are stationed on the coasts of hostile areas. The U.F.A. carries the co-operative banner against the weakening forces of competition. It carries the fight for public ownership against the strongholds from which the public has been exploited. The fight goes on, along many fronts. The bugle calls us from indifference to mental action. The battle is a battle of brains. The opposing forces, having had control of nearly all of the money, have been able to hire the brains. The call of the farmers is for volunteers. The farmers have no special privileges to give to those who serve in the cause. They offer only equal rights. Those who by sacrifice, of time and thought, help to establish a fairer system in our fair land than now prevails, will get the same reward as those who now do nothing. They will have the consciousness however of duty done. And we hope that if the old grafters cannot learn it, that the youth of Canada

will learn, that there are other things of value in life beside gold. The time is opportune. The old machinery is being scrapped and thrown into the melting pot, ready to be poured out and recast into new forms.

Public opinion will determine what those new forms will be. As in the beginning "The word (thought) was made flesh." So now the thoughts of men become cast into fixed laws and economic usages. Will your children live in the same kind of a world as now exists? It depends to some extent on you.

INJUSTICE VERSUS JUSTICE

The poet Goldsmith said of his time, "Wrong rules the land and waiting justice sleeps."

Once upon a time there were three (Honorable?) senators of Canada, appointed to guard the public interests in connection with the Beauharnois water power. We heard of them betraying the public, they were hired to protect. We hear of them being tried by their fellow senators. We have reason to hope that "waiting justice is not going to wait or sleep any longer, but that her sword will be drawn from its scabbard for action. One time we memorized: "Our fair Dominion now extends from Cape Race to Nootka Sound".

For a generation, we have watched the operation, in our "fair Dominion" of practices, which were unfair. We have seen the public robbed by the privileged few.

Truth and error have stood on the auction block side by side in this fair land. They have been sold to the highest bidder. Their relative intrinsic value has been ignored. Exploitation was impossible if truth were present, so error has been purchased "on time" and taken home. We are now faced with the overdue payments on our past purchases. Truth and error have been valued not for their worth to the public in general, but for their money making qualities. Exploitation made possible by the suppression of truth and the enthronement of error has facilitated the development of many millionaires. The lives hopes of a thousand paupers have been wrecked to make one millionaire. Modern practices are not so cruel as when the rank and file of men were "butchered to make a Roman holiday", but they are along the same line.

It is our belief that error cannot forever hold sway in the minds and hearts of men. Truth may be crowned at last.

"The mills of God grind slowly."

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again."

The eternal years of God are hers, While error wounded writhes in pain,

And dies among its worshippers."

May it so be, through the awakening of a sense of justice throughout that "Truth shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the earth."